

**North Carolina Mental Health Planning and Advisory Council
Meeting Minutes
3/5/04**

Members present:

Rich Greb, Chair	X	Bill Jones	X
Libby Jones, Co-Chair		Phyllis Kennedy	X
Jimmie Arrington		Jeff McCloud	X
Mary Bethel	X	Dr. James Osberg	X
Dorothy O'Neil		Pat Prescott	X
Rochelle Edwards		Chris Rakes	X
Dan Fox	X	Frank Read	
Dr. Linner Ward Griffin	X	Osborne Shamberger	
Kaye Holder	X	Paula Snipes	
Patricia Harris	X	Mary Reca Todd	X
John Hayes*		Carolyn Wiser	X
Ellen Holliman		Laura Yates	X
Bill Hussey		Guest: Susan Robinson	X
Diann Irwin		Guest: Peggy Balak	X
Lucy Dorsey	X		
Support Staff: Markita Keaton	X	Support Staff: Amy Smiley	X

Rich Greb, Chair

Rich opened the meeting by asking everyone to take a final look at the minutes. The Council approved the minutes, pending one correction made on page two by Mary Reca Todd.

Bill Jones, MHPC member

Bill conducted "Workshop Part II", which was the second phase of the orientation and technical assistance training for the Council. He reviewed the role of Mental Health Planning Council members and put it in the context of North Carolina's State Plan and mental health reform.

Amy Smiley, staff to the Council

Amy reminded the Council of the Federal Site Review that is to take place the week of March 10, 2004. The purpose for their visit and the proposed agenda was shared. The Council members who volunteered to participate in the interview on March 12th were confirmed. This will take place in the Albemarle Building in Raleigh from 9am-12pm. The volunteers are:

- ◆ Libby Jones
- ◆ Patricia Harris
- ◆ Pat Prescott
- ◆ Bill Jones
- ◆ Mary Recca Todd
- ◆ Jeff McCloud

Rich will attend the entrance interview on March 10, 2004 and represent the Council.

In addition, the idea of a member survey was proposed. Amy brought an example/draft copy of what one might look like. Amy asked the Council if something like this might be helpful in gaining information about the needs of the members. It was suggested that a subcommittee first discuss *what it is that the Council would like to find out*, then reconstruct the draft survey based on what the Council specifically wants to measure. Amy suggested that the Council think about its mission and its role when putting together a list of indicators. Dr. Linner Ward Griffin expressed that it was a good idea, once the subcommittee establishes what it is the Council wants to inquire about. Everyone agreed.

Bill Jones, Jeff McCloud, Patricia Harris and Phyllis Kennedy volunteered to head up a subcommittee to meet after the next meeting in May to begin working on this idea. Bill volunteered to contact other NAMPAC members and the national website to research if other Planning Councils had done such a thing and to review other possible surveys. Amy volunteered to contact other state employees that staff Planning Councils to inquire about possible surveys that have conducted. In the meantime, the Council will review this draft survey and discuss further at the next meeting.

Rich Greb, Chair

Rich updated the Planning Council on issues developing with the Governor's Advocacy Council for Persons with Disabilities. The Governor's Advocacy Council for Persons with Disabilities is the Protection and Advocacy agency for North Carolina. State P&As are federally mandated and funded programs that have the authority to provide legal representation and other advocacy services, under all federal and state laws, to all people with disabilities (based on a system of priorities for services).

P&As can exist within state government or can exist as private non-profit agencies outside of state Government. The GACPD is presently within state government in the Department of Administration. The process of moving a P&A

from one agency to another agency outside of state government (or the opposite) is called *redesignation*. The governor may be petitioned to redesignate the P&A, and only the governor has the authority to redesignate the state P&A. When a governor announces that he intends to redesignate the P&A, a formal process goes into effect. The vast majority of advocacy organizations in North Carolina have favored the redesignation of the GACPD to an agency outside of state government. Generally, the most often argued reason is the agency, in discharging its responsibility to protect the rights of individuals, should be totally independent of any possible interference by government.

In July 2003, the GACPD Board voted to seek redesignation and transition into a private non-profit agency outside of state government. It then started a planning process by having a number of public hearings across the state to learn what people wanted from a P&A. A draft of the by-laws of the new agency was approved in principle. Significantly, and consistent with comments heard during the public hearings, the board agreed to a process of selecting a new board for the agency. The process consists of selecting a nominating committee (made up of non-GACPD board members) which would review all applications to the new board, and then select the individuals for the new board. None of the present GACPD board members with one exception (the PAIMI chairperson), are assured positions on the new board.

Planning for the governance and business needs for the proposed new agency, called the Disability Rights Center of North Carolina (DRC-NC) is on-going. The governor has not yet announced a decision to redesignate.

The Protection and Advocacy for Persons with Mental Illness (PAIMI) Advisory Committee, is also federally mandated. The chairperson of the PAIMI committee must be a member of the state P&A board. In North Carolina, the Chair of the PAIMI Committee is appointed by the governor. Additionally two other PAIMI members are appointed to the GACPD board, one each by the Speaker of the House and the Senate Pro Tem.

In planning for the possible redesignation of the GACPD, the PAIMI committee is also drafting new by-laws. The committee has chosen to be self-perpetuating, but expanded its size to a maximum of fifteen members and this will allow up to nine new members to be added this year (including terms expiring this year). Additionally, it will have a vote to select a chairperson in a reasonable time after new members are selected. According to the new by-laws the PAIMI committee must consist of at least 50% consumers, and at least 80% consumers and family members.

Board member application forms for the Disability Rights Center of North Carolina can be found at www.drcnc.org, and applications for the PAIMI committee will be added to this site and are being sent out to advocacy agencies across the state.

Finally, Rich led the discussion of narrowing down some general ideas as to how the Council would like to recommend spending proposals based on the information Bonnie provided in our last meeting. To recap, during this fiscal year, \$9.6 million is budgeted for community based services. A total of almost \$8 million has been allocated to the community. Of this amount, \$3.3 million has been allocated to local programs for services for children with serious emotional disturbance and \$4.7 million has been allocated for services for adults with serious mental illness.

There is \$1.6 million from the MH Block Grant that is available for allocation and use through September 2005 has not yet been allocated. Of that amount, \$740,000 is for children's services and \$922,000 is for adult services. The Planning Council was asked to think about major service needs that should be given consideration for use as the mental health reform is implemented this year and next year.

The following are the concepts that were written on the board as the Council put their priorities into categories:

Community –Capacity Expansion

Psychosocial Rehabs
Supported Housing/Rental Assistance
Vocational/Employment Assistance
Long-Term Care Development
Service Definition Training
Assertive Community Treatment Teams

Jail/Prison Diversion

Consumer-Directed Initiatives

Recovery Action Plan/WRAP
"In Our Own Voice" NAMI program

Mental Health Services Development in Rural Areas of NC

Rich concluded the meeting by asking that this list be given to the Division and the Division use it to develop proposals and come back to the meeting with implementation scenarios. The Council agreed that it would be best to leave it with the Division to propose how these ideas might be played out. Amy will submit this list to the Division and return to the next meeting with follow-up to assist in the shaping of this discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 1:30 p.m.

Remaining dates for 2004 are now:

- ◆ May 7
- ◆ July 16
- ◆ September 17
- ◆ November 5